

associated with play-out of the digital video program, in which the play-out device includes a signature engine to generate a second unique signature for each frame of the digital video program being played out; and a matching engine to compare the second unique signature generated for each frame with a corresponding first unique signature encoded with the frame.

A. Response to Examiner's Arguments in Action of May 15, 2007

The Examiner recognizes that Copriviza fails to disclose a signature engine to generate a second unique signature for each frame of the digital video program being played out; and a matching engine to compare the second unique signature generated for each frame with a corresponding first unique signature encoded with the frame. The Examiner, however, asserts that these limitations are disclosed by Echeita.

In particular, the Examiner asserts that Echeita's "identifying overhead information" corresponds to the second unique signature generated for each frame as recited in claim 30. Even assuming that the uniqueness of each signature is established by the primary reference (Corpiviza), Echeita clearly discloses that the "identifying overhead information" is used to synchronize advertisement reconciliation data with a particular commercial at a transmission station (see col. 7, lines 25-43). Therefore, the "identifying overhead information" cannot correspond to generation of a second unique signature for each frame of the digital video program being played out.

Echeita further discloses that a reception station merely filters out data packets having advertisement reconciliation data for processing by a microcontroller 58 (col. 7, 43-53). The reception station does not generate of a second unique signature for each frame of the digital video program being played out, nor does Echeita disclose a matching engine to compare the second unique signature generated for each frame with a corresponding first unique signature.

encoded with the frame. For example, Applicant's present invention includes a matching engine to compare the second unique signature generated for each frame with a corresponding first unique signature encoded with the frame to ensure that each frame of a given video data has played out correctly (see Specification, page 5, line 21 – page 5, line 3). In contrast, in Echeita's advertisement reconciliation system, reconciliation data is sent to a computer for a comparison of assembled reconciliation data with contractually agreed-upon parameters. Echeita fails to disclose in general that the computer analyzes advertisements on a frame-by-frame basis.

B. The claim has limitations not taught by either reference

Both Copriviza and Echeita fail to disclose a signature engine to generate a second unique signature for each frame of the digital video program being played out; and a matching engine to compare the second unique signature generated for each frame with a corresponding first unique signature encoded with the frame, as recited in claim 30. Consequently, the combination of Copriviza and Echeita cannot render claim 30 obvious.

Claims 31-39 depend from claim 30, and are allowable for at least those reasons that apply to claim 30.

C. Other Independent Claims

Independent claim 40 (and the claims that depend therefrom) incorporate limitations similar to claim 30, and are also allowable over the references cited above for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 30.

Applicant submits that claims 30-49 are allowable over the references cited above, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

July 16, 2007

Date

/Kelvin M. Vivian/

Kelvin Vivian
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 475-1448